DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 075 361 SP 006 311

AUTHOR Wise, Pauline K.; And Others
TITLE A Cooperative Program in Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION Old Dominion Univ., Norfolk, Va.
PUB DATE Nov 71
NOTE 33p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Communication Skills; *Cooperative Programs; *Elementary Education; *Performance Based Teacher Education; Pilot Projects; *Preservice Education; *Teacher Attitudes; Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS *Distinguished Achievement Award Entry

ABSTRACT

An innovative program of teaching language arts, reading, and general curriculum to preservice elementary school teachers involved cooperation between Norfolk City Schools and Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia. Student participation was divided thus: 26 hours spent in the elementary schools, 30 hours in seminars, and 76 hours in large-group activities. Workshops and field trips were also held. Team teaching, differentiated staffing, and small-group colloquia were the teaching techniques used in the program. Interim planning, schedule revision, and evaluation and student conferences were held weekly. Student and faculty objectives were the basis for specific implementation of the program. Evaluation of the program included a pre- and posttest on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, a pre- and post interview, and informal appraisal of the course by students and involved faculty. Results showed an increase of desirable attitudes in students. Favorable comments on the program were made by students and faculty members. Recommendations were made for changes in the next phase of the program. (BRB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 075361

A COOPERATIVE PROGRAM IN TEACHER EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Pauline K. Wise
Annabel L. Sacks
Katherine T. Haggerty

SP 006 311

Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia
November, 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	BACKGROUND OF THE PROGRAM	1
II.	DEVELOPMENT OF THE PILOT PHASE	3
	Objectives	4
	Purpose of the Program	4
	Overall Objective	4
	Specific Objectives and Implementation	4
	Faculty Objectives and Implementation	5
	Student Objectives and Implementation	6
	Sequence of Program	13
III.	DISCUSSION OF THE PILOT PROGRAM	15
	Participation in Five Norfolk Elementary Schools	15
	Teaching Techniques	16
	Grouping Techniques	17
	Evaluation Techniques	18
IV.	EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM	19
	Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory	19
	Interviews	20
	Student Appraisal	21
	Faculty Appraisal	22
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS	25
VI.	APPENDICES	26

I. BACKGROUND OF THE PROGRAM

It can be questioned whether a teacher education program can accomplish the feat of producing the competent teacher in the isolation of the university. Critics of teacher education programs have focused on the lack of "relevance of present professional training to the daily work of teachers."[1] George E. Dickson, in his report on the Toledo Model for Teacher Education, states that

> ". . . it is not practicable . . . to prepare teachers for the outmoded self-contained classroom but rather to orient teacher training to a team-teaching type of elementary school organization. Elementary teachers who are to be involved with educational change must receive their training in connection with this type of school organization and practice."[2]

This mode of thinking is also reflected in the Forty-Seventh Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching:

> ". . . since generalizations grow from a series of experiences rather than the other way around, teacher education should apply such sound principles of learning theory to its own preparation. Most teacher education has always been conceptualized as preparation followed by practice."[3]

---

[1]Kevin A. Ryan, "A Plan for a New Type of Professional Training for a New Type of Teaching Staff," The Teacher and His Staff-Occasional Papers, No. 2, Washington, D. C.: NCTEPS National Education Association, February, 1968, p. 1.

[2]George E. Dickson, "Teacher Education in Transition," Journal of Research and Development in Education, Vol. 2, No. 3, (Spring, 1969), p. 15.

[3]Internships in Teacher Education, Forty-Seventh Yearbook, 1968, The Association for Student Teaching, Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, p. 41.

Thus, for the new teacher, new arrangements of information, theory, skills, and field experiences seem needed to provide a better answer.

The following innovative program incorporated organization and teaching methods other than the traditional self-contained lecture/examination format prevalent in most colleges. Thus, this model teacher education program demonstrated by example such techniques as team teaching, differentiated staffing and small group colloquia. It integrated "both the preparation and the practice--concurrently, simultaneously, and interdependently."[4]

---

[4] Ibid.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PILOT PHASE

The pilot phase of the innovative program in curriculum, language arts, and reading for undergraduate students in elementary education commenced in February, 1971. Fifty-five students registered for a nine hour block of courses. The three faculty who had conceived and planned the program during the previous semester were assigned to implement the program as a team.

Student participation in the program totalled 135 hours. Of these, twenty-six hours were spent in active participation in local elementary schools. Thirty hours were spent in seminars of fifteen to twenty students and seventy-nine hours were spent in large group activities. In addition, four voluntary workshops were conducted outside of class hours. One whole-class field trip was conducted at the newest elementary school in Norfolk. One interest-group field trip was conducted at a multi-media studio in Virginia Beach, Virginia.

The three faculty scheduled six hours a week each for interim planning, schedule revision, evaluation, and student conferences. To assure continuity and integration in team teaching, the three faculty were present during the seventy-nine hours of large group activities regardless of who was conducting the class. Each faculty was assigned to one or more of the participating elementary schools and regularly met with involved faculty for conferences and planning.

The faculty and student objectives identified during the planning phase (Fall semester, 1970) were incorporated into a sequence of activities. Continuous evaluation and feedback resulted in frequent re-stating of objectives and re-planning of activities.

Objectives

Purpose of the Program. An innovative program in the teaching of communication skills was designed to demonstrate a system of teaching from which could be extrapolated educational practices for the professional elementary school teacher. This program was viewed as a cooperative effort of Norfolk City Schools and Old Dominion University to improve the professional pre-service educational program of future teachers. Schools were identified in which members of the faculty were willing to work with Old Dominion University faculty to provide experiences to meet stated objectives. Experiences were specifically related to language arts, reading, and general curriculum of the elementary school.

Overall Objective. To involve the students in an experience in which theory and practice of teaching were closely associated.

Specific Objectives and Implementation. The following objectives and implementation are a description of the course as it actually materialized during the pilot phase.

Faculty Objectives and Implementation

Faculty Objectives	Implementation
1. To give students real-life experiences in elementary schools concurrent with methods courses	A. Planned and supervised observations concurrent with seminars and lectures on theory and methodology (1) Direct observations of teaching methods & pupils (2) Directed participation in elementary classrooms (microteaching)
2. To eliminate compartmentalization of traditional methods courses	A. Little, if any, separation of the core areas into conventional content courses
3. To eliminate repetition in traditional methods courses	Same as above
4. To demonstrate conventional and innovative techniques in the college classroom	A. Small group seminars B. Cooperative teaching (team) C. Multi-media approaches D. Flexible scheduling E. Role playing F. Special needs grouping G. Interest grouping H. Workshops I. Field trips J. Discovery method K. Individualized instruction L. Demonstrations M. Panel discussions N. Lecture/discussion O. Consultants and resource people
5. To establish rapport between faculty and students	A. Informal social sessions B. Small seminars C. Flexible grouping D. Shared observation in schools E. Panel discussions F. Individual conferences
6. To use faculty effectively	A. Cooperative teaching B. Group planning C. Development of an integrated and planned sequence of objectives D. Differentiated staffing

Faculty Objectives	Implementation
7. To establish cooperative programs with teaching centers	A. Bi-weekly meetings with local school personnel
8. To evaluate the innovative program in both the cognitive and affective domains	A. Pre- and post-course test on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory B. Pre- and post-course structured interview of a selected sample by a local elementary school principal C. Student evaluation of the program D. Pre- and post-course test on the Nelson Denny Reading Test E. Determination by faculty that students have reached stated cognitive objectives F. Evaluation of students by cooperating teachers in elementary schools

Student Objectives and Implementation

Area I: Overview: History and Philosophy of Education

Student Objectives	Implementation
1. Learns a brief background of education history and philosophy	A. Observes in assigned elementary school B. Reads in depth in resource materials C. Lecture/discussion

Area II: School and Classroom Organization:

Teacher/Pupil Interaction

Student Objectives	Implementation
1. Writes a description of the philosophy expressed in the interaction of teacher and pupil	A. Observes assigned elementary classroom B. Seminars C. Film D. Lecture/discussion
2. Writes a description of: (a) self-contained classroom (b) team-teaching (c) learning centers (d) departmentalization (e) open classroom (f) non-graded school (g) homogeneous grouping (h) heterogeneous grouping	A. Role playing by faculty B. Research
3. Develops a hypothetical organization of a school from data provided and defends organization	A. Simulation activity B. Lecture/discussion
4. Learns a background of classroom organization, grouping, and scheduling	A. Observes assigned elementary classroom B. Reads in depth in resource material C. Participates in role playing D. Lecture/discussion

Area III: Introduction to Language Arts

Student Objectives	Implementation
1. Acquires a background of the history and development of language in general and English in particular	A. Collects/views elementary books related to language B. Reads in depth in resource material C. Lecture/discussion
2. Acquires a background of language development	A. Observes and/or tapes language of preschool child B. Interprets tape or observation C. Lecture/discussion

Area IV: Language Readiness

Student Objectives	Implementation
1. Acquires a background in language readiness: (a) listening (b) speaking (c) reading (d) writing	A. Observes in assigned elementary classroom B. Small discussion groups C. Reading in depth in resource material D. Lecture/discussion
2. Produces, as part of a group, a booklet of language readiness activities in four areas listed in 1 above	From above and further library research
3. Acquires the skill of manuscript writing	A. Demonstration by faculty B. Supervised individual practice
4. Develops evaluation standards for manuscript writing	A. Simulation exercise

Area V: Language/Experience

Student Objectives	Implementation
1. Makes a group experience chart with children	A. Develops chart with children (microteaching) in assigned elementary classroom B. Reads in depth in resource material C. Lecture/discussion
2. Writes a creative story	A. Brainstorms in small groups B. Lecture/discussion

Area VI: Developmental Reading

Student Objectives	Implementation
1. Defines reading	A. Simulation exercise B. Lecture/discussion
2. Differentiates among approaches to teaching reading (basal, language-experience, individualized, phonics, linguistics, other orthography, performance contract) re: (a) view of definition of reading (b) view of language (c) view of learning theory (d) view of children (e) role of teacher and/or pupil (f) materials	A. Panel discussion by faculty B. Field trip/materials demonstration C. Seminar D. Resource lecturer (local principal involved in performance contract)
3. Defines: (a) achievement grouping (b) interest grouping (c) research grouping (d) special needs grouping (e) partner grouping (f) tutorial grouping	A. Lecture/discussion
4. Calculates independent, instructional, and frustration reading levels from data given	A. Administration of Informal Reading Inventory by special reading teacher from local school B. Lecture/discussion
5. Contrasts and compares the goals, techniques, and materials of the primary and intermediate reading programs	A. Lecture/discussion

Area VII: Skill Units in Language Arts: Broad Planning

Student Objectives	Implementation
1. Develops behavioral objectives	A. Workshop B. Application in a group social studies unit C. Application in an individual lesson plan D. Seminar E. Lecture/discussion
2. Differentiates between planning for a broad unit and planning a subject matter unit	A. Demonstration of broad unit planning B. Lecture/discussion
3. Observes the development of a lesson plan from a broad unit	A. Demonstration by faculty
4. Participates in a lesson from above plan	A. Lesson taught by discovery method B. Each student writes a Haiku
5. Volunteer group produces a multi-media presentation with Haiku	A. Field trip to multi-media studio B. Participates in multi-media workshop
6. Participates in a creative drama experience	A. Creative drama workshop by consultant
7. Demonstrates competency in transformational grammar	A. Workshop B. Special needs group C. Lecture/discussion
8. Discriminates between listening and auding	A. Demonstration with flannel-board B. Demonstration with puppets C. Flannelboard workshop ┐ Interest D. Puppet workshop ┘ Groups E. Lecture/discussion

Area VIII: Content Areas: Social Studies, Science, Math

Student Objectives	Implementation
1. Defines curriculum	A. Reading B. Lecture/discussion
2. Defines social studies	A. Resource lecturer: ODU faculty (social studies)
3. Becomes familiar with theories of curriculum in the content areas: (a) concentric circle theory (b) spiral curriculum (c) sequential (d) mechanistic (e) organismic	A. Lecture/discussion
4. Defines science	A. Reading in depth B. Lecture/discussion
5. Defines mathematics	A. Reading in depth B. Lecture/discussion

Area IX: Unit and Lesson Planning

Student Objectives	Implementation
1. Demonstrates ability to integrate language arts with a content area by developing a unit plan in social studies	A. Observation in elementary classroom B. Small group work C. Research
2. Develops a lesson plan for a language arts lesson	A. Microteaching in elementary classroom
3. Develops a lesson plan from a basal reader using Directed-Reading-Thinking-Activity (DRTA)	A. Microteaching in elementary classroom

Area X: Word Attack Skills

Student Objectives	Implementation
1. Demonstrates competency in phonics	A. Programmed phonics text B. Adequate performance on phonics test
2. Acquires a background in the teaching of word attack skills: (a) picture clues (b) configuration (c) context (d) phonic analysis (e) structural analysis (f) dictionary skills	A. Lecture/discussion

Area XI: Evaluation

Student Objectives	Implementation
1. Is able to evaluate progress in reading	A. Demonstration of use of standardized test B. Demonstration of Informal Reading Inventory C. Lecture/discussion
2. Is able to evaluate progress in the various areas in language arts	A. Self-evaluation techniques B. Demonstration of standardized tests C. Development of check lists D. Lecture/discussion
3. Is able to report pupil progress	A. Examination of anecdotal records, report cards, cumulative folders B. Lecture/discussion

Sequence of Program

The following outline was developed to sequence the above objectives:

I. Introduction
   A. Overview of history and philosophy of education
   B. Preparation for observation in the schools

II. School and Classroom Management
   A. School organization
   B. Classroom management
   C. Teacher/pupil interaction

III. Introduction to language arts
   A. History of language
   B. Development of English
   C. Language development in children

IV. Language Readiness
   A. Listening
   B. Speaking
   C. Reading
   D. Writing
   E. Readiness activities

V. Language Experiences
   A. Handwriting
      1. Manuscript
      2. Cursive
   B. Experience chart
   C. Creative writing

VI. Developmental Reading
   A. Introduction
   B. Historical approaches to teaching reading
   C. Current approaches to teaching reading
      1. Basal reader
         Directed-reading-thinking-activity
      2. Language experience
      3. Phonics
      4. Linguistic
      5. Programmed
      6. New alphabet
      7. Individualized
      8. Performance contract
   D. Primary versus intermediate reading
   E. Instructional grouping
      1. Evaluating reading achievement
      2. Informal reading inventory

VII. Unit Planning and Lesson Planning
- A. Behavioral objectives
- B. Broad planning versus subject matter
- C. Planning a unit
- D. Planning a lesson
- E. Demonstration of discovery method with Haiku poetry

VIII. Content Areas of the Curriculum
- A. Social studies
- B. Science
- C. Mathematics

IX. Skill Units
- A. Grammar and usage
- B. Transformational generative grammar
- C. Word attack skills
- D. Comprehension in reading
- E. Spelling
- F. Listening
- G. Oral reading and story telling

X. Evaluation
- A. Report cards
- B. Cumulative records
- C. Parent-teacher conferences

III. DISCUSSION OF THE PILOT PROGRAM

Participation in Five Norfolk Elementary Schools

A planning session was held with the principals of the five elementary schools which had been identified by the Director of Elementary Education, Norfolk City Schools, and the three faculty members involved in the program. The purpose of this session was to familiarize the principals with the objectives of the program and encourage them to select teachers who would be willing to work with students to attain these objectives. Twenty-eight teachers were subsequently identified. An informal orientation meeting was held prior to the first participation session. The cooperating elementary school teachers, principals, and college faculty attended. Students were assigned in pairs to each teacher except at one school where students were assigned to teams of teachers at various grade levels.

A schedule of twenty-six hours of planned observations was set up in the elementary schools to coordinate with the sequence of classroom activities at the college. A college faculty member was assigned to each school and a bi-weekly schedule of meetings was set up with the cooperating teachers.

The participation phase of the program consisted of both direct observation of teachers, pupils and teaching methods and directed participation in the elementary classroom. Each participation experience was followed up at the college by a

seminar composed of the faculty member and students involved in a particular school or schools. The purpose of the seminars was to allow students to discuss their experiences, share impressions, ask questions and relate theory to reality. Occasionally written reports related to their participation were required (e.g., a description of observed pupil-teacher interaction). At the end of the semester the cooperating teachers were asked to informally evaluate the students.

Teaching Techniques

The course was designed and implemented by the same three faculty for the purpose of capitalizing on the strengths of each. These strengths determined the faculty member who was responsible for certain lectures or demonstrations.

In order to assure continuity and eliminate compartmentalization and repetition, all three faculty were generally present during every class session. Faculty always felt free to comment on and participate in all lecture/discussions. Continuous evaluation and re-planning was effected by several scheduled work sessions each week during which the progress of the course was reviewed and future plans determined. Frequently, changes were made in upcoming plans as a result of needs which had been identified in the evaluation but not previously anticipated. The changes made most frequently related to time and sequence.

Team teaching was the framework within which conventional and innovative techniques were presented. Lecture/discussion

was found to be a necessity to give the students common conceptual backgrounds. However, an attempt was made to use the lecture/discussion method sparingly because it traditionally represented the sole technique for college teaching.

Since it was believed that the lecture/discussion technique was the least desirable for use with elementary school children, an effort was made to present material in the college class using techniques which could be used successfully in elementary classrooms; e.g., demonstrations, role-playing, field trips, discovery method, audio-visual media, simulation exercises, panel discussions. The technique chosen was the one considered most appropriate to the subject matter to be presented.

Grouping Techniques

In contrast to the usual whole class presentation prevalent in the college classroom, different grouping techniques were not only discussed but used.

From the continuous evaluation, it was possible to identify those students in need of special help in certain areas. Small groups were formed to meet these needs. In addition, students who showed special interest in certain facets of the curriculum, e.g., multi-media, puppetry, creative writing, were given the opportunity to participate in extra-curricular workshops. Faculty were available for individual instruction and conferences when requested by the students.

Evaluation Techniques

Rather than limit evaluation of the students solely to written examinations and/or grades on papers and projects, students were required to demonstrate competency in certain areas; e.g., experience charts, manuscript writing, unit plans, lesson plans. Competency was evaluated as satisfactory when the student's performance reached a certain level (See Appendix I and II). Since the objective was satisfactory performance, students were permitted as many opportunities as necessary with no prejudice. In addition to course requirements, students were given the opportunity to enhance their grade by completing certain approved optional activities. As further evidence of competencies and attitudes, cooperating teachers in the elementary schools were asked to evaluate informally students who had participated in their classrooms.

IV. EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

Four types of appraisal of the effect of the course are reported. These included a pre- and post-test on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, a pre- and post-interview of a random sample of students, informal appraisal of the course by students and an appraisal by the involved faculty.

Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory

(The following is based on a research study, A Descriptive Study of an Instructional Method and its Effect on Attitudes, by Marjorie Lee, Old Dominion University, completed August, 1971).

According to some authorities, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory measures attitudes towards children, curriculum, and the role of the teacher with high reliability. These attitudes are significantly correlated with the teacher-pupil relations found in the classroom.[1]

According to a study by Standlee and Popham, the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory may be utilized not only as an index of the type of social atmosphere a teacher

---

[1]Walter W. Cook, C. H. Leeds, and R. Callis, Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory Manual (New York, N. Y.: The Psychological Corporation, 1951).

will maintain in the classroom, but also, with caution, as an index of a teacher's overall performance.[2]

The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory was administered twice to forty-eight students in the program. The mean score for the first administration, at the beginning of the semester, was 42.5; the mean score for the second administration, at the end of the semester, was 76.3. The t of 6.76 was significant at greater than the .001 per cent level (Table 1).

Table 1 - Comparison of Means on Pre-test and Post-test

Group	N	Test	Mean	Sig. Dif.
Total Sample	48	Pre-test	42.5	$t = 6.76 > .001$
		Post-test	76.3	

Therefore, it was concluded that the course was successful in its attempt to build desirable attitudes in its students.

Interviews

(The following is based on a study by Theodore Forte, Principal, Norfolk Public Schools).

A random sample of twenty students was given a pre-post interview by Mr. Forte. Both interviews consisted

---

[2]Lloyd S. Standlee and W. J. Popham, "The MTAI as A Predictor of Over-All Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, LI (April, 1959), pp. 319-320.

of five questions based on important facets of the elementary school program including teaching of reading and social studies, individualization of instruction, grouping for instruction, and discipline (See Appendix III).

A comparison of the pre- and post-interview ratings indicated "definite progress in all students." Mr. Forte also reported that almost every student regarded the classroom experience (in elementary schools) as a most valuable part of the program. In his opinion, the program was "more beneficial to students than separate 'methods' courses."

Student Appraisal

Students' appraisal of the course was overwhelmingly favorable. The following are representative comments excerpted from the student evaluations.

". . . helpful to see what really happens in the classroom."

". . . better prepared for student teaching."

". . . methods . . . more useful because I had to do them with children."

"I have become more interested in the field of education and I can understand what being a teacher is about."

"It gave me the chance to apply what I was learning. . . try out some of my ideas before I was given the responsibility of student teaching."

"I feel the most important thing I learned was just about kids in general."

"I learned a lot about school organization, classroom organization, teacher-pupil interaction in my school . . . more than I would have learned from a book."

"I wish every methods course offered students the choice to go out and get involved in the schools. Practicing what we learn is the only way that I feel that I really learn."

"The participation in public schools was a gratifying experience, especially in conjunction with this course because if you were confronted with a problem or situation you weren't sure about you could come into the seminars the next day and talk about it and find out ways of improving what you did."

"There is no way that I can 'undersell' the experience that I obtained through participating in the school. . . And, although, I had taken 297 this experience as presented was an altogether new 'ballgame.'"

"It is one thing to learn something in class and another to put it into action."

"It was most interesting to see what we were learning or reading about in actual practice."

"This first-hand experience helped me to utilize some of the approaches that I learned in this class."

Students' criticisms of the course related mainly to the texts and required outside readings. Students (and faculty) felt that the selected texts were not entirely relevant to the structure of the course. Assigned outside readings were too loosely woven into the organization of the course and, consequently, it was felt that maximum benefit was not derived.

Faculty Appraisal

Although evaluation by the faculty was a continuing process from which changes evolved during the pilot semester of the course, it was felt that an overall appraisal was needed for futur planning.

In the original design of the program it had been anticipated that close cooperation between college faculty and participating elementary school teachers would lead to frequent meetings, in-service workshops, joint planning and

eventually to the establishment of a corps of teachers dedicated to the improvement of teacher education and the development of model teaching centers. However, although the teachers were extremely cooperative in implementing the participation experience, they did not feel the need to involve themselves any further. Therefore, contact between involved faculty and cooperating teachers was limited to brief bi-weekly meetings to discuss forthcoming student participations.

Each participation experience was followed-up by small group seminars for the purpose of discussing experiences. These groups were comprised of students from the same schools each time which seemed to narrow the students' perspectives. Apparently the seminars were too frequent to be exciting and meaningful. However, it was not possible to utilize this time except for small group activities because of space limitations. Some adjustments were made by substituting special-needs and interest groups during this time.

Team teaching proved to be one of the most successful aspects of the program. The cooperative planning of the course resulted in a well-organized, and comprehensive scope and smoothly running sequence. Because of the pooling of ideas and talents, the faculty felt it was the best-planned course they had ever taught. It was enlightening to discover that the success of team teaching was in direct proportion to the amount of time and energy expended in planning. Furthermore, each team member felt enriched by the experience of

sharing knowledge, ideas and know-how. The support of other members of the team encouraged faculty to experiment in ways they might have felt hesitant to try alone.

The nine contact hours per week contributed to rapport between faculty and students. However, a close relationship was fostered by the relaxed and informal atmosphere that seemed to pervade the course. The team provided a variety of personalities to whom the students could relate.

Elimination of repetition of content made it possible to use class time for participation in schools and seminars. Two of the team members were concurrently teaching separate sections of the same courses with no time allotted for involvement in schools. These courses were taught almost entirely on a lecture/discussion basis for forty-five contact hours. It was found that the students in the innovative program performed as well on examinations using identical test items as the students in the separate sections.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on suggestions from the students and evaluation by the faculty.

1. More time scheduled for participation in the schools: weekly, alternate days (Students).
2. Less frequent and more varied seminars (Faculty).
3. More workshops incorporated as part of the course to be held earlier in the semester (Students and faculty).
4. Microteaching in small groups in college class (Faculty).
5. Rescheduling of certain key areas to allow for practice in needs-groups (Faculty).
6. Consideration of new texts to provide background information more relevant to the course (Students and faculty).
7. Discussion of required outside readings (Students and faculty).

These recommendations will be the basis for changes made in the planning of the next phase of the program.

APPENDIX I

EXPERIENCE CHART EVALUATION

	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement	Unsatisfactory
I. Manuscript			
a. Letter formation			
b. Spacing between letters			
c. Spacing between words			
II. Chart Form			
a. Indentation			
b. Spacing			
c. Margins			
d. Spelling and punctuation			
III. Exceptional quality			

Overall Grade _____

APPENDIX II

DRTA LESSON PLAN EVALUATION

	Satisfactory S	Needs Improvement N	Unsatisfactory U
I. All lesson plan steps included			
a. Objectives			
b. Procedure			
c. Materials			
d. Evaluation			
II. Use of DRTA Approach			

Grade:_____

APPENDIX III

It has been my pleasure to be associated, in a small way, with a new plan for teaching methods courses at the college level. A team of teachers has combined its efforts into one large nine credit course, involving some sixty students, on an experimental basis.

A pre-post interview of twenty students was conducted by this writer. Five questions were asked in the pre-interview and repeated in the post-interview within a different framework. The subjects of the questions were based on several important facets of the elementary school program, and included such topics as (1) the teaching of reading and social studies, (2) individualization of instruction, (3) grouping for instruction, and (4) discipline.

Without question, definite progress was evident in all students based on answers given in the post-interview.

A most valuable part of this course was the actual classroom experience of the students received in several Norfolk City elementary schools. This was mentioned by almost every student interviewed.

In the opinion of this writer, this course, conducted in the manner in which it was, is more beneficial to students than separate "methods" courses. In a team teaching situation, the intelligence, planning, and effort of the teachers involved is so much more concentrated, and chance of too much repetition is eliminated.

Certainly the instructors have learned much and have already begun planning changes for next year.

1. You walk into your first classroom and find no reading texts. What do you do?

2. What are the Social Studies and what will be your approach to teaching them?

3. What process will you use for grouping children for instruction?

4. What is good discipline?

5. In studying a unit on Greece three children became interested in archeology. When the next unit of Rome was introduced these children wished to remain with their study which had advanced to underwater discoveries -- What would your reaction be?

Scale: 5 4 3 2 1
High Low

Name	I		II		III		IV		V	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
1.	2	2	2	3	3	2	4	4	3	4
2.	2	4	3	5	1	4	4	4	2	4
3.	3	5	4	5	3	5	4	5	4	5
4.	3	5	3	5	2	5	4	5	3	4
5.	2	2	2	3	1	3	1	3	1	3
6.	2	4	2	3	3	4	2	4	3	5
7.	1	3	1	3	2	4	2	4	2	4
8.	3	4	2	3	2	4	3	4	2	4
9.	2	4	3	4	3	3	1	3	1	
10.	2	4	3		3	4	2	4	3	4
11.	1	3	1	2	2	3	1	3	1	3
12.	3	4	3	5	4	5	4	5	2	5
13.	1	3	2	3	1	3	3	4	4	5
14.	2	4	2	3	4	4	2	4	2	
15.	3	5	2	3	3	4	3	4	4	5
16.	2	5	1	3	2	3	3	4	3	5
17.	2	4	3	3	1	4	2	4	3	3
18.	1	4	2	4	2	4	3	4	4	5
19.	2	4	2	5	2	4	3	4	4	4
20.	1	3	2	4	2	3	3	3	4	4